

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1 (currently amended). A quasi-vertical semiconductor component, comprising:

a surface;

a semiconductor substrate;

a well;

at least ~~two~~ three inner cells disposed in said well;

a buried layer disposed between said well and said semiconductor substrate;

a sinker zone disposed outside a region of said inner cells and defining to which a sinker voltage is applied, said sinker zone connecting said buried layer to said surface of the semiconductor component; and

said inner cells having substantially similar values for forward currents and reverse currents being independent of a positional relationship to said sinker zone by making a spacing distance between said inner cells which are disposed farther away from said sinker zone larger than a spacing distance between said inner cells which are disposed closer to said sinker zone varying a given width of said inner cells and/or a given radius of curvature of said inner cells and/or a spacing between said inner cells in dependence on the sinker voltage.

2 (canceled).

3 (currently amended). The semiconductor component according to claim 1, wherein said inner cells have body zones with a given width and a given radius of curvature, and that at least one of said given width of said body zones, said given radius of curvature of said body zones, and a spacing between said body zones of said inner cells is varied.

4 (currently amended). The semiconductor component according to claim 3, wherein said body zones which are disposed closer to said sinker zone have a larger width wider and/or have a larger radius of curvature than said body zones which are disposed farther away from said sinker zone in a vicinity of said sinker zone than at a distance from said sinker zone.

5 (canceled).

6 (currently amended). The semiconductor component according to claim 1, further comprising doped regions disposed in said well, a variation of at least one of said given width, said given radius of curvature and said spacing between said inner cells is effected by said doped regions.

7 (original). The semiconductor component according to claim 6, wherein said doped regions are introduced by high-energy ion implantation.

8 (original). The semiconductor component according to claim 7, wherein said doped regions lie between said well and said body zone of said inner cells.

9 (original). The semiconductor component according to claim 1, wherein said well has an edge region and said sinker zone is disposed at said edge region.

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9 are subject to examination. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 have been amended. Claims 2 and 5 have been or were previously canceled.

Under the heading "Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the recitation of "in dependence on the sinker voltage" in claim 1. The objected to language has been deleted from claim 1.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112" on pages 2-4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 3-9 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In regards to claim 1, the Examiner objected to the language of "varying a spacing ...". Claim 1 has been rewritten to make the spacing language clear.

In regards to claim 4, Applicant has amended claim 4 to reflect the Examiner's interpretation of claim 4.

In regards to the objection of claim 5, Applicant has deleted claim 5 but has incorporated the Examiner's interpretation of claim 5 into claim 1.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102" on pages 4-6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 9 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,589,405 to Contiero (hereinafter Contiero) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As noted in item 7 of the Office Action, claim 5 is indicated as being allowable. The features of allowable claim 5 have been incorporated into claim 1. Therefore, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" on pages 6 and 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 7 and 8 have been rejected as being obvious over Contiero under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from amended claim 1. Amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable, and therefore claims 7 and 8 are also believed to be allowable.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9 are solicited.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph E. Locher  
USPTO Reg. No. 41,947

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100 Fax: (954) 925-1101